DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 270 505 TM 860 395

AUTHOR Baker, Jean
TITLE A Five-Year Assessment of the State Compensatory Education Program in the Dade County Public Schools, Miami, Florida.
PUB DATE Apr 86
NOTE 48p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (70th, San Francisco, CA, April 16-20, 1986).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; *Compensatory Education; *Cost Effectiveness; *Educational Assessment; Educational Trends; Elementary Education; Interviews; *Longitudinal Studies; Pretests Posttests; Program Evaluation; Questionnaires; School Funds; *School Surveys; *State Programs; Student Attitudes; Teachers; Teaching Methods
IDENTIFIERS *Dade County Public Schools FL

ABSTRACT

This study presents a 5-year assessment of the State Compensatory Education program in the Dade County Public Schools (Florida) on the achievement of pupils, attitudes of pupils, instructional strategies, program focus, and cost effectiveness. This study is limted to a survey of program trends appearing in grades two through six. The sample includes: (1) 4,000 students providing pre- and post-test results for 1980-85; (2) 100 instructors providing staff information; and (3) 600 students providing student attitude information for the years 1981-82 and 1983-84. Data on instructional climate are provided by results of questionnaires submitted to instructors, interviews with instructors and administrators, and classroom assistants and are compiled each year. It is concluded that this is not a program but a funding source. The administrators have applied funds in the way they consider most helpful to their individual schools. The program has been cost effective: pupils are making positive gains toward age appropriate levels. In summary, the students who were selected (based on low standardized test scores) are learning and are happy about it. Teachers are enthusiastic, the administrators are pleased, and the State is satisfied. By all indications, an effective use of funds has been made. (PN)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED270505

A FIVE-YEAR ASSESSMENT OF THE STATE COMPENSATORY EDUCATION PROGRAM IN THE DADE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS, MIAMI, FLORIDA

Jean Baker
Dade County Public Schools

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. H. Baker

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC).

Paper presented at the annual meeting of the
American Educational Research Association

San Francisco, California
April 1986

TM 860 395

A Five-Year Assessment of the State Compensatory Education Program in the Dade County Public Schools, Miami, Florida

Purpose of the Study

The general purpose of this study is to present a five-year assessment of the effects of the State Compensatory Education program on the achievement of pupils, attitudes of pupils, instructional strategies, program focus and cost effectiveness.

Overview

The Florida Accountability Act of 1976 directed the Commissioner of Education to establish minimum performance standards in the basic skills of reading, writing, and mathematics. The Commissioner was further directed to implement a program of statewide assessment testing to determine the extent of improvement of the mastery of these skills by students in the public schools. The statewide assessment program was established for grades 3, 5, 8, and 11 and subsequently amended to grades 3, 5, 8, and 10.

In 1977 the Florida Compensatory Education Act was passed to provide supplemental assistance to students identified as needing special educational assistance in order that their level of achievement may be raised to that appropriate for their age and to ensure that they achieved mastery of the minimum performance standards required for promotion and graduation.

Funds are allocated on the basis of the number of students who score at or below the 25th percentile on the State Student Assessment tests (SSAT I and II) and the funds are an entitlement to each district. Funds may only be used to provide direct remedial instruction to target students and must be supplementary to other state, local and federal funds.

Since 1977, the Florida Legislature has appropriated funds each year under this Compensatory Education Act for the provision of supplementary instructional services to low achieving students in grades K through 12. The release of funds to each county is contingent upon the submission and acceptance of a plan describing the program, objectives, and evaluation procedures. The objectives must be realistic and measureable.

The instructional activities planned must be related exclusively to the classroom teaching of the basic skills and must be in addition to, not in place of, the instruction in the basic skills which students would normally receive from locally funded personnel. This instruction in basic skills is to be directed toward mastery of State minimum performance standards and district student performance objectives. Instruction is to be provided through one or more of four delivery systems. They are (1) homogeneously grouped classrooms, (2) pull-out laboratories which students attend for varying lengths of time, (3) individual or small group tutoring during the regular school day, and (4) tutoring before or after school.

The effectiveness of the program is to be evaluated in terms of increase in student achievement in the basic skills reading, mathematics, and writing as measured by the administration of a pretest and a post test to students receiving educational assistance from the funds provided.

Dade County proposed to provide two programs: (1) a program of basic skills directed toward mastery of State minimum performance standards for students in grades K-10 who scored in stanines 1 and 2 on standardized tests of basic skills and (2) a program of tutorial instruction for students in grades 11 and 12 who had not mastered the standards required by the State for graduation. The district has received an average of approximately $5,000,000 each year and has served an average of 15,000 students each year.

In keeping with the Dade County concept of school-based program planning and management, each school is permitted to design and implement a program model that is considered most appropriate to the individual school needs and funding available. Generally, the school is allocated $250 per student per subject. The programs range from $500 to provide reading instruction for two students to two full-time teachers to a school with 100 students who meet the selection criteria. The net effect is to reduce class size.

Performance evaluations are performed each year to assess the differences between test results before and after exposure to the remediation provided by the program. These differences are then used to determine successful instructional strategies used to provide remediation and to provide input in planning future strategies. The focus of the study is to examine trends noted in the overall characteristics of five years of implementation to enable program managers to assess the effectiveness of the program.

Methodology

A criterion referenced evaluation is used to assess program effectiveness since the State requires that the instructional intent of the program should be focused on the mastery of the basic skills which the State assesses through the annual administration of the State Student Assessment test. The results of the State tests serve as a pretest for the selected students. There were no commercially developed tests which the district felt were adequate to provide a valid post measure of student mastery of the skills specified by the State. In order to provide a valid measure of the degree of mastery achieved by the students who received instruction, the evaluation department developed a series of tests referenced to the State criteria. The tests were developed according to State specifications which stated requirements for stimulus and response attributes including vocabulary and sentence length controls. The locally developed tests were then equated to the State test using the RASCH equating method. Table I shows a summary of the measurement instruments used to assess the performance of the students.

The performance results were assessed according to the staffing, operational characteristics and instructional strategies as they either aided or hindered the effective implementation of the program. An effort was made to determine which combinations of staffing patterns, organizational structures and instructional strategies appeared to produce greater achievement gains.

Surveys submitted to Compensatory Education instructors and interviews and observations conducted with selected instructors were used to collect staffing information. An attitude inventory, "My Class", was used to collect student information. Copies of these instruments appear in the appendix.

Data Source

This study is limited to a survey of program trends as they appear in grades 2-6. This is the one phase of the program that has remained stable. Throughout the seven years of implementation, grade levels have been added and deleted according to perceived needs of the district. A sample of approximately 4,000 students for whom pre and post test results were available were used to assess perforance for each of five years 1980-85. A sample of 100 instructors provided staffing information each year. A sample of six hundred students surveyed during 1981-82 and 1983-84 provided student attitude information.

Results of the Study

Instructional Climate

Results of questionnaires submitted to instructors, interviews with instructors and administrators, and classroom assistants were compiled each year. (Refer to Tables I and III.) A change noted was a shift from the use of teachers to the use of aides in some instances. This, however, was not a program trend; the staffing changes were a result of population change. Schools were allocated approximately $250 per instructional service and all funds were used for direct instructional salaries. If a sufficient number of students qualified, a full-time teacher was hired, if not, full-time or part-time aides were employed to assist regular classroom teachers.

The instructional staff was well qualified. Approximately forty percent of the compensatory education teachers had a master's degree or above. One half of them had had an average of more than four years experience in Dade County Schools. Ninety percenty of them had a regular teaching certificate in elementary education. The others were provisionally certified until required education course work was completed.

The quality of instruction did not appear to be a concern. In response to questionnaires and interview questions, the instructors showed a positive and enthusiastic attitude toward the program. They worked closely with the classroom teachers in providing individualized instruction to remediate diagnosed deficiencies.

The aides reinforced skills, provided practice activities, and tutored individuals or small groups under the direction of the compensatory education or classroom teacher.

Observations were conducted in compensatory education classrooms using selected indicators from teacher performance instruments developed by the Georgia Department of Education. A summary of the results that appears in Table III. The results indicated that the majority of the teachers demonstrated a variety of methods and techniques to convey information to the pupils. They were well organized, managed the classrooms well, and reinforced the efforts of the learners to maintain involvement. Most demonstrated enthusiasm and helped develop positive self concepts. In some instances, an area of weakness was noted, the effective use of instructional time. This involved getting the children on task promptly and helping them understand what they might achieve through their participation. Occasionally there were avoidable delays in instruction for materials distribution and movement of learners. Instructional activities did not always fill the alloted time.

Materials and equipment were generally adequate and in sufficient quantity to meet the special needs of the pupils. In most instances, there was adequate space to house the program. There were, however, some schools with critical space problems in all areas which, of course, included the Compensatory Education Program.

In responding to questionnaires and interviews. many compensatory education instructors requested some sort of inservice or at least group meetings to learn more about program objectives, methods, and materials. Principals expressed satisfaction with the latitude they were permitted in selecting procedures best suited to the particular needs of their schools also indicated a desire for an inservice for their teachers.

This desire for inservice was a noted trend. However, since funds were for direct instruction only, formal inservice has not been provided.

Nature of the Students

Pupils selected to receive remediation through SCE funding were those who scored in stanines 1 or 2 on the reading comprehension and/or the mathematics computation subtests of the Stanford Achievement Test. These students comprised approximately six percent of the total population of the students in grades 2-6.

The characteristics of this group of pupils, high absenteeism, transiency, and poor motivation contributed to their low achievement and continued to do so during the program. This population also included pupils that were scoring at the chance level as well as those that had repeated grades the required number of times and had been promoted to their appropriate age level. It was recognized that pupils, especially those in the intermediate grades, scoring in stanines 1 and 2 have to spend considerable time with the basic decoding and comprehension skills in order to read the minimum performance standards before they would be able to exhibit knowledge of them.

An attitude inventory, "My Class," was given to a randomly selected sample of 20 SCE students in grades 4 and 6 in 30 schools during 1981-82 and in 30 different schools during 1983-84. The results of these surveys appear in Table IV. There were 528 responses the first year and 589 the second. The forty-five survey items are categorized under subscales indicating the degree of student satisfaction with a class and the degree of friction, competitiveness and cohesiveness among the students in he class and the perceived difficulty of the class work.

In both years, 80 percent or more of the students indicated that they felt students in their class were satisfied. Forty to sixty percent of the students felt that some students didn't get along with each other. However, 80 percent or more felt many students were friends and 60% felt everyone in class was a friend. Thirty to fifty percent of the students felt the work was difficult, but 70 percent or more felt that the students were able to do it. Seventy percent felt that most students wanted to do their best work but less than 60 percent felt that speed was important. In general, the results of the survey indicated that the students in the SCE classes had a positive attitude toward their classes. They were being challenged but were working at a level where success was possible. A positive self concept apparently had been conveyed when only 20% of the pupils stated that "only smart pupils can do their work."

Achievement Trends

In an effort to assess trends that might be apparent in the achievement progress of pupils who received assistance from the SCE program, the results of the annual pre and post testing were examined. The scores examined for changes were those of pupils for whom a computer match determined both pre and post test scores were available. This match also revealed that less than 10 percent of the students were in the program for more than one year, as shown in Table XI.

The results shown in Tables V and VI show achievement changes for approximately 6000 students in each subject for each of five years. At each grade level the average post test score increased. However, the interesting thing about the scores was not the change, but the pattern of change and the stability of the increases. The gain scores at each grade level remained nearly constant. For example communication skills pupils in grade 2 made a 27 or 28 percent increase each year, grade 5 pupils made a 5 to 7 percent increase, and so forth. The pretest score changes but the number of additional post test questions answered correctly remains the same. This suggests that each year the target population had approximately the same ability and were able to make similar progress toward the mastery of the criteria measured by the test.

In an effort to determine which delivery system seemed to make a difference in achievement, these same scores were translated into the percentage of students in each model who achieved or made progress toward meeting the objective set by the district. The objective was to make a score equivalent to the State requirement of mastery of 70% of the minimum performance standards in grades 3 and 5, and prorated scores in the other grades. The State considers a program successful if 90 percent of the remediated students either meet or show progress toward mastery of the standards. The progress made by students in each of the delivery systems is shown in Tables VII through X. An examination of the percentages showed no particular trend. Eighty to ninety percent of the students showed progress. The delivery system did not appear to have an effect.

These students were selected on the basis of norm-referenced test results. The Stanford test results of these students with matched pre and post test scores were examined after participation in the program. Subtest scores were available from approximately 21,000 of the mathematics students and 22,000 of the communication skills students. The data show that approximately 80 percent of the students who had participated in the program for one year had improved their skills enough to move out of the 1 and 2 stanine bracket. Fifty percent of the two-year students improved their skills beyond the first two stanines. These data appear in Tables XII and XIII.

The trend noted in the achievement progress of the students was one of slow progress toward the mastery of the minimum performance standards in the basic skills.

Conclusions and Recommendations

First of all, this is not a program, it is a funding source. The State has mandated that all students exhibit mastery of what it considers the minimum number of skills in reading and writing and mathematics necessary to function as productive citizens. In addition, it has allocated funds to assist the public schools in achieving this goal. Table XIV shows that the district has been progressively successful.

In effect, this funding has provided the schools with funds to establish mini remedial mathematics and reading programs, which most systems can never seem to afford. It is a simple, straight forward, no frills "program". All funds are for direct instruction to pupils. The only "paperwork" involved is a list of students instructed and a pre and post test administered at the beginning and end of each year. When a "program analysis" is attempted to determine "best procedures," "best conditions," "instructional approaches," and so forth, the "program" does not fit into any of the established patterns. The students needed individualized instruction and they are receiving it and responding to it. The administrators have applied the funds in a way that they consider to be most helpful in their individual schools. What works for one school may not work in another school. They are credited with the judgment to choose wisely and make effective use of the additional instructional time.

Data collected concerning the program has been provided to program planners. On occasion, it has helped them verify decisions. Periodically there have been groups initiating changes in methods, goals, or procedures. The information has given them reason to keep the program as it is. It has been cost effective in that the pupils are making positive gains toward reaching a level appropriate for their age.

In conclusion, the students who were selected because they scored lowest on a standardized test are learning and are happy about it. The teachers are enthusiastic, the administrators pleased, and the State is satisfied. By all indications, an effective use of the funds has been made. This trend toward learning should be continued.

TABLE I

A SUMMARY OF THE MEASUREMENT
INSTRUMENTS USED IN THE ASSESSMENT OF THE
STATE STUDENT COMPENSATORY EDUCATION PROGRAM
IN DADE COUNTY, FLORIDA PUBLIC SCHOOLS

GRADE	REMEDIATION SELECTION INSTRUMENT	REMEDIATION SELECTION CRITERION	PRE-MEASUREMENT INSTRUMENT	POST-MEASUREMENT INSTRUMENT	PROGRAM OBJECTIVE[3]
2	SESAT[1]	Stanines 1-2	DCCEST[2]	DCCEST	47% (2/3 of 70%)
3	SAT[4]	Stanines 1-2	SSAT[5]	DCCEST	70% (3/3 of 70%)
4	SAT	Stanines 1-2	DCCEST	DCCEST	56% (4/5 of 70%)
5	SAT	Stanines 1-2	SSAT	DCCEST	70% (5/5 of 70%)
6	SAT	Stanines 1-2	DCCEST	DCCEST	84% (6/5 of 70%)
7	SAT	Stanines 1-2	DCCEST	DCCEST	61% (7/8 of 70%)
8	SAT	Stanines 1-2	SSAT	DCCEST	70% (8/8 of 70%)
9	SAT	Stanines 1-2	DCCEST	DCCEST	63% (9/10 of 70%)
10	SAT	Stanines 1-2	DCCEST	SSAT	70% (10/10 of 70%)

[1]SESAT - Stanford Early School Achievement Test

[2]DCCEST - Dade County Compensatory Education Skills Test, referenced to State standards

[3]Minimum performance requirements for students in grades 2, (4 and 6), 7 and 9 are prorated to the 70% State minimum level required of students in grades 3, 5, 8 and 10, respectively.

[4]SAT - Stanford Achievement Test

[5]SSAT - State Student Assessment Test, referenced to State standards

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE 11
SURVEY OF INSTRUCTORS BY
QUESTIONNAIRES AND INTERVIEWS

	1980-81	1981-82	1982-83	1983-84	1984-85
EMPLOYMENT STATUS					
Classroom teacher	52%	54%	49%	43%	38%
Aide or Assistant	48%	46%	51%	57%	62%
TYPE OF EMPLOYMENT					
Full-time	43%	45%	39%	36%	33%
Part-time	57%	55%	61%	64%	67%
DUTIES OF AIDES					
Reinforce skills	39%	41%	50%	58%	62%
Provide practice activities	39%	40%	52%	60%	63%
Tutor individuals	39%	39%	54%	62%	70%
Tutor small groups	36%	41%	56%	61%	75%
Prepare materials	33%	40%	30%	20%	18%
Record data	39%	42%	20%	22%	16%
AVERAGE CLASS/GROUP SIZE					
Teacher	15	12	16	18	15
Aide	3	4	7	6	7
ORGANIZATION MODEL					
Separate Class	3%	2%	3%	47%	42%
Pull-out Laboratory	76%	79%	78%	30%	33%
Tutorial Regular Day	12%	11%	15%	16%	17%
Tutorial Extended Day	9%	8%	4%	7%	8%
ARTICULATION					
Common planning time	31%	20%	18%	15%	16%
Scheduled conferences	10%	8%	7%	6%	8%
Transmittal forms	22%	25%	41%	49%	48%
Informal meetings	37%	47%	34%	30%	28%
ADEQUATE MATERIALS	92%	91%	93%	92%	93%
ADEQUATE SPACE	88%	89%	87%	88%	85%
MOST REQUESTED NEED					
Inservice	51%	53%	78%	81%	82%

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE III

FROM TEACHER PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENTS DEVELOPED BY THE GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
AVERAGE RATINGS* OF CLASSROOM TEACHERS EXHIBITING COMPETENCIES BASED ON OBSERVATIONS USING SELECTED INDICATORS

	1980-81	1981-82	1982-83	1983-84	1984-85
CLASSROOM PROCEDURES:					
USES INSTRUCTIONAL TECHNIQUES, METHODS, AND MEDIA RELATED TO THE OBJECTIVES.					
1. Uses teaching methods appropriate for objectives, learners, and environment.	4	4	3	4	4
2. Uses instructional materials that provide learners with appropriate practice on objectives.	4	4	4	4	4
COMMUNICATES WITH LEARNERS.					
3. Gives directions and explanations related to lesson content.	4	3	4	4	4
4. Clarifies directions and explanations when learners misunderstand lesson content.	4	4	4	4	4
5. Provides feedback to learners throughout the lesson.	4	4	3	4	3
6. Uses acceptable written and oral expression with learners.	5	4	4	5	4
REINFORCES AND ENCOURAGES LEARNER INVOLVEMENT IN INSTRUCTION					
7. Uses procedures which get learners initially involved in lessons.	3	3	4	3	4
8. Provides learners with opportunities for participating.	4	4	5	5	4
9. Reinforces and encourages the efforts of learners to maintain involvement.	4	4	4	4	4
10. Demonstrates knowledge in the subject area.	4	3	4	3	4
ORGANIZES TIME, SPACE, MATERIALS, AND EQUIPMENT FOR INSTRUCTION.					
11. Uses instructional time effectively.	4	3	4	3	3
12. Provides a learning environment that is attractive and orderly.	4	5	4	4	5
INTERPERSONAL SKILLS:					
DEMONSTRATES ENTHUSIASM FOR TEACHING AND LEARNING AND THE SUBJECT BEING TAUGHT.					
13. Communicates personal enthusiasm.	4	4	5	4	4
14. Stimulates learner interest.	4	4	4	4	4
15. Conveys the impression of knowing what to do and how to do it.	5	4	4	4	4
HELPS LEARNERS DEVELOP POSITIVE SELF-CONCEPTS.					
16. Demonstrates warmth and friendliness.	4	4	4	5	6
17. Demonstrates patience, emphathy, and understanding	4	3	4	4	4
MANAGES CLASSROOM INTERACTIONS.					
18. Provides feedback to learners about their behavior.	5	4	4	3	5
19. Maintains appropriate classroom behavior.	4	4	4	5	4
20. Manages disruptive behavior among learners.	4	4	4	4	4

* All indicators are rated on a scale from 1 to 5, with 3 considered average and 5 exceptional.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE IV
RESULTS OF STUDENT RESPONSES TO "MY CLASS" SURVEY CATEGORIZED BY SUBSET

		1981-82 % YES	1983-84 % YES
SATISFACTION			
1.	Pupils like their school work in my class.	82	83
7.	Most pupils like this class.	78	20
11	Some pupils don't like the class.	41	51
16.	Most children in my class like school.	85	80
21.	Most children say the class is fun.	82	80
27.	Some pupils are not happy in class.	46	50
31.	Children seem to like the class.	95	87
36.	Some of the pupils don't like the class.	36	51
43.	The class is fun.	87	82
FRICTION			
2.	Children are always fighting with each other.	46	37
6.	Some of the children in our class are mean.	49	59
13.	Many children in the class like to fight.	48	47
17.	Some pupils don't like other pupils.	47	52
22.	Some people in class are not my friends.	51	55
23.	Children have secrets with other children in class.	60	61
26.	Some children don't like other children.	55	65
32.	Some pupils always want to have their own way.	58	72
37.	Children in our class fight a lot.	40	43
41.	Some pupils don't like what other pulls do.	62	65
COMPETITIVENESS			
8.	Children often race to see who can finish first.	54	63
12.	Most children want their work to be better than their friend's work.	77	82
18.	Some pupils feel ban when they do not do as well as the others.	86	80
25.	Most children don't care who finishes first.	58	60
30.	Some pupils always try to do their work better than the others.	82	80
35.	In our class some pupils always want to do best.	93	92
42.	A few children in my class always want to be first all of the time.	74	74
DIFFICULTY			
3.	The same people always do the best work in our class.	70	61
4.	In our class the work is hard to do.	29	32
10.	Most children can do their schoolwork without help.	84	81
14.	Only the smart people in our class can do the work in our class.	33	45
20.	In our class all pupils know how to do their school work.	74	64
24.	Children often find their work hard.	55	62
29.	Only the smart pupils can do their work.	19	42
34.	Many pupils in our class say that school is easy.	52	43
39.	Some pupils always do better than the rest of the class.	73	76
40.	Schoolwork is hard to do.	30	44
44.	Most of the pupils in my class know how to do their work.	93	87
COHESIVENESS			
5.	My best friends are in my class.	75	73
9.	Many children in the class play together after school.	90	87
15.	In my class everybody is my friend.	62	62
19.	In my class I like to work with others.	94	92
28.	All of the children know each other well.	86	80
33.	All pupils in my class are close friends.	68	65
38.	All the pupils in my class like each other.	59	52
45.	Children in our class like each other as friends.	81	80

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE V

A COMPARISON OF THE AVERAGE CHANGE IN THE PERCENTAGE OF CORRECT RESPONSES ON THE PRE TO POST TESTS OF COMPENSATORY EDUCATION PUPILS AS MEASURED DURING 1980 - 1985

COMMUNICATION SKILLS

GRADE	1980 - 81			1981 - 82			1982 - 83			1983 - 84			1984 - 85		
	PRE	POST	CHANGE	PRE	POST	CHANGE	PRE	POST	CHANGE	PRE	POST	CHANGE	PRE	POST	CHANGE
2	47.2	74.7	+27.7	45.9	74.2	+28.3	47.4	74.4	+27.0	50.0	77.4	+27.4	49.7	78.4	+28.7
	n=795			n=575			n=616			n=663			n=623		
3	59.4	78.1	+18.7	59.1	77.4	+18.3	61.3	82.1	+20.8	60.6	82.7	+22.1	61.3	83.1	+21.8
	n=803			n=668			n=704			n=719			n=809		
4	39.4	50.6	+ 9.6	42.4	53.6	+11.2	45.3	56.7	+11.4	46.1	56.9	+10.8	46.5	57.1	+10.6
	n=550			n=446			n=415			n=434			n=592		
5	61.2	67.1	+ 5.9	59.3	66.4	+ 7.1	60.1	66.5	+ 6.4	60.5	65.4	+ 4.9	61.0	66.9	+ 5.9
	n=746			n=485			n=552			n=684			n=804		
6	55.9	68.8	+12.9	59.4	70.3	+10.9	63.9	73.7	+ 9.8	63.9	72.9	+ 9.0	62.6	74.1	+11.5
	n=581			n=386			n=435			n=561			n=535		

The interesting thing about the raw score change is its stability. The gain scores for each grade do not vary more than 2 or 3 points. The pretest may vary but the number of additional questions answered correctly on the post test remains the same.

3/4/86
sh:READ/CHART

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE VI

A COMPARISON OF THE AVERAGE CHANGE IN THE PERCENTAGE OF CORRECT RESPONSES ON THE PRE TO POST TESTS OF THE COMPENSATORY EDUCATION PUPILS AS MEASURED DURING 1980 - 1985

MATHEMATICS SKILLS

GRADE	1980 - 81			1981 - 82			1982 - 83			1983 - 84			1984 - 85		
	PRE	POST	CHANGE	PRE	POST	CHANGE	PRE	POST	CHANGE	PRE	POST	CHANGE	PRE	POST	CHANGE
2	43.9	71.6	+27.7	44.8	75.2	+30.4	44.3	74.8	+30.5	48.2	75.5	+27.3	47.3	75.2	+27.9
	n=651			n=403			n=433			n=744			n=619		
3	55.9	74.3	+18.4	53.4	82.3	+28.9	56.8	83.7	+26.9	69.6	90.8	+21.2	64.5	86.2	+21.7
	n=469			n=376			n=432			n=882			n=814		
4	39.2	58.4	+19.2	40.6	59.4	+18.8	43.5	63.0	+19.5	45.5	63.3	+17.8	46.2	63.6	+17.4
	n=409			n=291			n=552			n=578			n=588		
5	48.2	64.8	+16.6	48.4	70.8	+22.4	52.2	68.8	+16.6	50.5	67.9	+17.4	50.9	69.7	+18.8
	n=511			n=429			n=552			n=534			n=788		
6	60.0	72.7	+12.7	60.1	72.7	+12.6	67.3	78.4	+11.1	66.0	77.5	+11.5	62.6	74.1	+11.5
	n=350			n=246			n=266			n=594			n=539		

The interesting thing about the raw score change is its stability. With the exception of grade 3 pupils in 1981-82 and 1983-84, the gain scores do not vary more than 2 or 3 points. The pretest score may vary but the number of additional questions answered correctly on the post test remains nearly the same.

3/4/86
sh:MATH/CHART

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE VII

PERCENT OF STUDENTS WHO ACHIEVED THE OBJECTIVES* SET BY THE DISTRICT
OR WHO MADE GAINS TOWARD THESE OBJECTIVES

SEPARATE CLASS

		1980-81		1981-82		1982-83		1983-84		1984-85	
Grade 2	R	100.0	(n=18)	65.0	(n=19)	62.6	(n=19)	81.2	(n=431)	81.1	(n=322)
	M	90.2	(n=17)	80.0	(n=20)	83.3	(n=14)	94.0	(n=410)	81.9	(n=321)
3	R	73.9	(n=23)	78.9	(n=21)	91.1	(n=22)	92.7	(n=466)	81.9	(n=516)
	M	--	(n= 0)	79.2	(n=15)	95.2	(n=21)	81.1	(n=464)	82.3	(n=525)
4	R	68.0	(n=25)	90.1	(n=32)	88.2	(n=17)	93.1	(n=336)	88.5	(n=331)
	M	88.9	(n=15)	63.1	(n=27)	81.8	(n=15)	77.2	(n=341)	85.5	(n=332)
5	R	92.7	(n=19)	74.2	(n=16)	90.0	(n=28)	92.4	(n=381)	91.1	(n=550)
	M	--	(n= 0)	75.6	(n=17)	93.3	(n=30)	95.0	(n=458)	89.7	(n=543)
6	R	87.5	(n=16)	75.3	(n=20)	89.1	(n=16)	85.6	(n=285)	86.9	(n=352)
	M	80.0	(n=17)	76.8	(n=15)	89.3	(n=30)	79.3	(n=380)	90.1	(n=358)

* The objective for pupils in grades 3 and 5 was to achieve a score that was equivalent to 70% mastery of the grade 3 and 5 State minimum performance skills. At the other grade levels, the objective was pro-rated according to the grade level of the students. Grade 2 was expected to achieve 2/3 of the grade 3 objective; grade 4, 4/5 of the grade 5 objective; grade 6, 6/5 of the grade 5 objective.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

sh:SEPARATE/CLA

TABLE VIII

PERCENT OF STUDENTS WHO ACHIEVED THE OBJECTIVES* SET BY THE DISTRICT OR WHO MADE GAINS TOWARD THESE OBJECTIVES

PERIODIC PULL-OUT

	1980-81	1981-82	1982-83	1983-84	1984-85
Grade 2 R	93.2 (n=555)	95.1 (n=484)	91.6 (n=302)	87.4 (n=70)	95.1 (n=114)
M	95.8 (n=307)	93.2 (n=384)	93.4 (n=345)	94.2 (n=104)	93.2 (n=115)
3 R	82.8 (n=530)	89.6 (n=534)	90.1 (n=475)	90.1 (n=112)	89.8 (n=120)
M	92.8 (n=320)	95.1 (n=339)	83.9 (n=290)	94.3 (n=162)	93.3 (n=118)
4 R	84.1 (n=353)	85.6 (n=300)	84.1 (n=298)	87.2 (n=32)	95.2 (n=113)
M	88.6 (n=237)	92.1 (n=144)	89.2 (n=181)	83.4 (n=84)	95.3 (n=115)
5 R	84.4 (n=392)	72.9 (n=378)	95.1 (n=327)	94.1 (n=34)	86.1 (n=102)
M	91.5 (n=189	91.6 (n=241)	89.3 (n=198)	---- ------	94.1 (n=97)
6 R	82.1 (n=331)	79.7 (n=297)	76.8 (n=319)	75.4 (n=65)	76.5 (n=61)
M	82.7 (n=197)	85.6 (n=189)	87.5 (n=185)	82.4 (n=51)	95.0 (n=62)

* The objective for pupils in grades 3 and 5 was to achieve a score that was equivalent to 70% mastery of the grade 3 and 5 State minimum performance skills. At the other grade levels, the objective was pro-rated according to the grade level of the students. Grade 2 was expected to achieve 2/3 of the grade 3 objective; grade 4, 4/5 of the grade 5 objective; grade 6, 6/5 of the grade 5 objective.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

sh:PERIODIC/PUL

TABLE IX

PERCENT OF STUDENTS WHO ACHIEVED THE OBJECTIVES* SET BY THE DISTRICT OR WHO MADE GAINS TOWARD THESE OBJECTIVES

TUTORIAL REGULAR SCHOOL DAY

	1980-81	1981-82	1982-83	1983-84	1984-85
Grade 2 R	82.6 (n=46)	86.1 (n=36)	92.1 (n=59)	93.2 (n=140)	96.1 (n=142)
M	90.3 (n=41)	87.1 (n=45)	93.2 (n=81)	93.4 (n=188)	92.3 (n=140)
3 R	80.0 (n=50)	89.1 (n=58)	85.2 (n=84)	86.1 (n=118)	87.2 (n=133)
M	88.6 (n=35)	93.2 (n=42)	86.6 (n=64)	85.2 (n=198)	88.1 (n=134)
4 R	59.8 (n=26)	78.3 (n=42)	71.3 (n=90)	89.1 (n= 54)	93.9 (n=127)
M	90.9 (n=22)	82.6 (n=43)	83.1 (n=60)	88.3 (n=119)	95.1 (n=129)
5 R	68.3 (n=30)	78.9 (n=76)	84.1 (n=68)	85.1 (n=126)	86.1 (n=120)
M	80.0 (n=20)	85.4 (n=40)	76.9 (n=39)	81.2 (n=192)	90.0 (n=115)
6 R	92.4 (n=53)	89.7 (n=95)	88.7 (n=41)	88.2 (n=179)	88.1 (n= 97)
M	96.6 (n=23)	86.3 (n=54)	87.1 (n=36)	82.1 (n=121)	95.0 (n=100)

* The objective for pupils in grades 3 and 5 was to achieve a score that was equivalent to 70% mastery of the grade 3 and 5 State minimum performance skills. At the other grade levels, the objective was pro- rated according to the grade level of the students. Grade 2 was expected to achieve 2/3 of the grade 3 objective; grade 4, 4/5 of the grade 5 objective; grade 6, 6/5 of the grade 5 objective.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

sh:TUTOR/REG

TABLE X

PERCENT OF STUDENTS WHO ACHIEVED THE OBJECTIVES* SET BY THE DISTRICT OR WHO MADE GAINS TOWARD THESE OBJECTIVES

TUTORIAL EXTENDED SCHOOL DAY

		1980-81	1981-82	1982-83	1983-84	1984-85
Grade 2	R	94.5 (n=34)	96.1 (n=77)	96.2 (n=51)	96.7 (n=22)	93.1 (n=45)
	M	100.0 (n=33)	97.1 (n=49)	100.0 (n=24)	94.1 (n=48)	91.4 (n=43)
3	R	81.8 (n=55)	82.9 (n=79)	97.0 (n=67)	96.6 (n=23)	89.2 (n=37)
	M	78.5 (n=14)	89.1 (n=39)	90.1 (n=50)	88.6 (n=58)	89.2 (n=37)
4	R	83.3 (n=42)	82.6 (n=40)	80.7 (n=30)	90.1 (n=33)	95.2 (n=21)
	M	91.3 (n=23)	89.2 (n=27)	84.2 (n=19)	88.1 (n=18)	90.9 (n=22)
5	R	93.2 (n=44)	77.4 (n=60)	87.1 (n=38)	88.1 (n=38)	93.7 (n=32)
	M	84.2 (n=19)	75.3 (n=46)	85.0 (n=20)	84.2 (n=20)	89.3 (n=31)
6	R	82.2 (n=36)	83.1 (n=23)	71.4 (n=21)	76.0 (n=32)	92.1 (n=25)
	M	83.4 (n=15)	66.1 (n= 9)	70.4 (n=27	72.3 (n=42)	92.0 (n=26)

* The objective for pupils in grades 3 and 5 was to achieve a score that was equivalent to 70% mastery of the grade 3 and 5 State minimum performance skills. At the other grade levels, the objective was pro- rated according to the grade level of the students. Grade 2 was expected to achieve 2/3 of the grade 3 objective; grade 4, 4/5 of the grade 5 objective; grade 6, 6/5 of the grade 5 objective.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

sh:TUTOR/EXTEND

TABLE XI

Number of years of participation in State Compensatory Education (SCE) by students who entered the program in any one of the years 1979-80, 1980-81, 1981-82, 1982-83, 1983-84 for whom matched SCE pre and post test data were available.

Mathematics Skills
N = 27,880

1 Year	2 Years	3 Years
91.3%	8.1%	0.6%
N = 25,454	N = 2,258	N = 168

Communication Skills
N = 30,428

1 Year	2 Years	3 Years
89.9%	9.3%	0.8%
N = 27,354	N = 2,831	N = 243

The data indicate that ninety percent of the SCE students were in the program for one year, suggesting that they were not eligible for a second year; they were able to move into a developmental program.

TABLE XII

Stanford stanine scores for the State Compensatory Education (SCE) students who participated in the program for one year (1979-84) for whom matched pre and post SCE scores and Stanford scores were available.

One-year Participants in the SCE Mathematics Skills Program
Mathematics Computation Subtest
n = 21,732

Stanine 1,2	Stanine 3,4,5	Stanine 6,7	Stanine 8,9
20.5%	63.5%	14.5%	1.1%
n=4,542	n=13,800	n=3,151	n=239

One-year Participants in the SCE Communication Skills Program
Reading Comprehension Subtest
n = 22,969

29.1%	61.4%	8.8%	.7%
n=6,683	n=14,105	n=2,021	n=160

Stanford subtest scores were available for 21,732 mathematics skills students and 22,969 communication skills students who participated in the SCE program for one year. The data indicate that eighty percent of the one-year mathematics students and seventy percent of the reading students improved their skills enough to move out of the 1 and 2 stanine eligibility bracket.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE XIII

Stanford stanine scores for the State Compensatory Education (SCE) students who participated in the program for two years (1979-84) for whom matched pre and post SCE scores and Stanford scores were available.

Two-year Participants in the SCE Mathematics Skills Program
Mathematics Computation Subtest
n = 2,088

Stanine 1,2	Stanine 3,4,5	Stanine 6,7	Stanine 8,9
37.5%	53.9%	7.8%	.8%
n=783	n=1125	n=164	n=16

Two-year Participants in the SCE Communication Skills Program
Reading Comprehension Subtest
n = 2,308

44.9%	50.6%	4.1%	.4%
n=1036	n=1167	n=94	n=11

Stanford subtest scores were available for 2,088 mathematics skills students and 2,308 communication skills students who participated in the SCE program for two years. The data indicate that over fifty per cent of these students improved their skills enough to move out of the 1 and 2 stanine eligibility bracket.

TABLE XIV
DADE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS
STATE STUDENT ASSESSMENT TEST
DISTRICT SUMMARY

SSAT, PART I
AVERAGE PERCENT MASTERY

SKILL AREA	GRADE	1977-78	1978-79	1979-80	1980-81	1981-82	1982-83	1983-84	1984-85
READING	3	77*	93	86	86	88	88	89	90
	5	75*	90	82	84	86	87	86	91
	8	70*	82	80	81	83	84	83	87
	10	--	--	--	--	84	83	86	88
	11	73*	87	83	85	86	--	--	--
WRITING	3	77*	95	90	89	90	93	94	95
	5	75*	89	83	85	86	87	90	89
	8	70*	86	87	87	88	89	91	91
	10	--	--	--	--	80	82	87	89
	11	73*	75	80	80	83	--	--	--
MATHEMATICS	3	89	91	89	88	90	89	91	92
	5	77	86	84	83	85	85	87	88
	8	69	83	81	81	82	84	85	86
	10	--	--	--	--	78	83	85	87
	11	74	77	82	80	81	--	--	--

SSAT, PART II
PERCENT OF STUDENTS PASSING

SKILL AREA	GRADE	1977-78	1978-79	1979-80	1980-81	1981-82	1982-83	1983-84	1984-85
COMMUNICATIONS	10	--	--	--	92	93	90	85	80
	11	90	96	97	97	--	--	--	--
MATHEMATICS	10	--	--	--	73	71	68	79	77
	11	59	72	76	74	--	--	--	--

* THE OCTOBER 1977 READING AND WRITING RESULTS WERE NOT REPORTED SEPARATELY, BUT INSTEAD AS A SINGLE COMPOSITE SCORE FOR COMMUNICATION. THAT SINGLE SCORE APPEARS IN BOTH THE READING AND WRITING COLUMNS FOR 1977-78 ONLY.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDIX

DADE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS

KEY PUNCH USE ONLY

COMPENSATORY EDUCATION PROGRAM

Instructor Questionnaire

Date _____

School _____ School Number _____ 1 - 4

To be completed by persons (teachers or paraprofessionals), who provide the compensatory education supplementary basic skills instruction.

1. Current Employment Status. (Check One.)

_____ Classroom Teacher
_____ Teacher Aide/Assistant
_____ Volunteer

5

2. Current Employment. (Check One.)

_____ Full-Time, Compensatory Education
_____ Part-Time, Compensatory Education

6

3. If you are a classroom teacher, do you have the assistance of an aide, assistant or volunteer when you are instructing compensatory education pupils? (If you are a teacher aide, assistant or volunteer, leave 3 and 4 blank and go to question 5.)

_____ Yes, Full-Time
_____ Yes, Part-Time
_____ No

7

4. If yes, what are their duties? (Check as many as apply.)

_____ Reinforce skills and provide practice activities.
_____ Tutor individuals
_____ Tutor small groups
_____ Prepare materials
_____ Record data
_____ Other _____

8 - 13

5. If you are a teacher aide, assistant or volunteer, what are your duties? (Check as many as apply.) (If you are a classroom teacher, leave 5 blank and go to question 6.)

_____ Reinforce skills and provide practice activities.
_____ Tutor individuals
_____ Tutor small groups
_____ Prepare materials
_____ Record data
_____ Other _____

14 - 19

COMPENSATORY EDUCATION PROGRAM

Instructor Questionnaire
(Continued)

Classroom teachers, teacher aides, assistants or volunteers are requested to respond to questions 6-23.

6. Educational background. (Check only the highest level).

_____ Below High School
_____ High School Graduate or Equivalent
_____ Less than 2 years college credit
_____ Associate degree or 2 years credit
_____ More than 2 years without degree
_____ Bachelors degree
_____ Masters degree
_____ Above Masters degree
_____ Other_____ 20

7. Years of classroom experience in Dade County Schools. (Count 1980-81 as 1 and check one.)

_____ 1 - 3
_____ 4 - 8
_____ More than 8 21

8. Certification type. (Check One.)

_____ Regular
_____ Temporary
_____ No Certification 22

9. Certification field. (Check One.)

_____ Elementary education
_____ Early childhood
_____ No certification
_____ Other_____ 23

10. Which compensatory service do you provide? (Check One.)

_____ Reading
_____ Mathematics
_____ Both 24

Instructor Questionnaire
(Continued)

Classroom teachers, teacher aides, assistants or volunteers are requested to respond to questions 6-23.

11. What is the grade level of the compensatory education pupils that you work with? (Check One.)

_____ Primary K-3
_____ Intermediate 4-6
_____ Both

25

12. What is the total number of different compensatory education pupils that you work with during one week? (Class Load.)

_____

26-28

13. How many sessions of one or more compensatory education pupils do you work with in one week? (Average number of classes.)

_____

29-30

14. What is the average number of compensatory education pupils that you work with at one time? (Average class size.)

_____ Reading
_____ Mathematics
_____ Combination Reading and Mathematics

31-36

15. What organizational models are used to provide reading or mathematics services to the pupils that you work with? (Check as many as apply.)

	Reading	Mathematics	Kindergarten Read.& Math.
Separate class	_____	_____	_____
Pull-Out	_____	_____	_____
Tutorial (Reg.Sch.Day)	_____	_____	_____
Tutorial (Ext.Sch.Day)	_____	_____	_____

37-48

Classroom teachers, teacher aides, assistants or volunteers are requested to respond to questions 6-23.

16. Who diagnoses the basic skills deficiencies for the compensatory education pupils that you work with? (Check as many as apply.)

_____ Regular Basic Skills Teacher
_____ Compensatory Education Instructor
_____ Other_____ 49 - 51

17. Who prescribes the remediation program for the compensatory education pupils that you work with? (Check as many as apply.)

_____ Regular Basic Skills Teacher
_____ Compensatory Education Instructor
_____ Other_____ 52 - 54

18. What method do you usually use to communicate with the pupils' regular basic skills teacher? (Check as many as apply.)

_____ Common Planning Time
_____ Scheduled Conferences
_____ Prescription Folders
_____ Written Communication
_____ Transmittal Forms
_____ Classroom Visitations
_____ Informal Meetings
_____ Other_____ 55 - 62

19. Generally, how often do you communicate with the regular basic skills teacher regarding the progress of the compensatory education pupils that you work with? (Check the most typical.)

_____ Once a semester
_____ Once a grading period
_____ Once a month
_____ Once every two weeks
_____ Once a week
_____ Daily
_____ Other_____ 63

COMPENSATORY EDUCATION PROGRAM

Instructor Questionnaire (Continued)

Classroom teachers, teacher aides, assistants or volunteers are requested to respond to questions 6-23.

20. What curriculum materials are used in your Compensatory Education Program?

READING

_____ Dade RS/VP
_____ SWRL
_____ Harper & Row Reading Basics
_____ Houghton Mifflin Reading Series
_____ Ginn Reading 720
_____ Hils
_____ Other _____
_____ Do Not Instruct in Reading

64 - 71

MATHEMATICS

_____ Dade Systems Approach to Mathematics
_____ SWRL
_____ Addison Wesley - Mathematics In Our World
_____ Heath - Mathematics Program
_____ Houghton Mifflin - Mathematics
_____ Rand McNally - Developing Mathematical Processes
_____ Other _____
_____ Do Not Instruct in Mathematics

72 - 79

21. Do you have an adequate supply of materials for the Compensatory Education Program?

80 [1]
1 - 4 DUP.

Reading Materials	Mathematics Materials
_____ Yes	_____ Yes
_____ No	_____ No

5 - 6

22. Do you have adequate space in which to provide the compensatory education services?

Reading	Mathematics	Kindergarten
_____ Yes	_____ Yes	_____ Yes
_____ No	_____ No	_____ No
_____ Do Not Instruct	_____ Do Not Instruct	_____ Do Not Instruct
_____ in Reading	_____ in Mathematics	_____ in Kindergarten

7 - 9

23. What recommendations do you suggest for the improvement of the compensatory education program? _____

80 [2]

_____

_____

COMPENSATORY EDUCATION
OBSERVATION FORM

Date _____

School Name _____ School Number _____

School Address _____

Contact (Principal, A.P., etc.) _____

Allocation _____ Actual _____ Adjustments _____

Placement

How was eligibility determined?

Stanford Preliminary List (Spring) _____
Stanford Final List (Spring) _____
Eligibility List (Aug.) _____
Test Scores Transmittal Card _____
CTBS _____

When did c.e. classes start? _____ Other _____

If late, why? _____

Problems with placement. _____

Other Problems _____
(Identification, Staff, Scheduling, Space)

Sample Class

Grade ___ 4 ___ 6 Reading _____ Mathematics _____

(If combination, grades _____)

Time Scheduled _____ to _____ Days _____

INSTRUCTOR'S NAME _____

Teacher _____ Full Time _____ Part Time _____

Aide _____ Full Time _____ Part Time _____

# of Aides in Class Assisting Instructor _____

Model: Separate Class _____ Tutorial (Regular Day) _____

Pull Out _____ Tutorial (Extend. Day) _____

COMPENSATORY EDUCATION
OBSERVATION FORM

Enrollment

Number of pupils present: _____

Grade 4 _____
Grade 6 _____
Other _____

Apply following to grade level of class observed. (Check Grade)

Grade 4 ____ Grade 6 ____

Number on pre-roster _____

Number on pre-roster still enrolled _____

Number still enrolled with pre-test _____

Number of pupils added since 9/26/80 _____

Number of pupils exited since 9/26/80 _____

Comment _____

Are PDBS #'s on roster? Yes ____ To Be Mailed ____

Can pre-roster be used as class roster? Yes ____ No ____

If no, obtain roster. Yes ____ To Be Mailed ____

Materials

Reading:

Dade RS/VP _____
Harper & Row _____
Houghton Mifflin _____
Ginn _____
Hils _____
Other _____

Do you have adequate materials for the program? Yes ____ No ____

Do you have adequate space for the program? Yes ____ No ____

COMPENSATORY EDUCATION
OBSERVATION FORM

Instruction

Individualized Program:

Diagnose Deficiencies:

Comp. Ed. Teachers _____
Reg. Basic Skills Tchrs _____
Other _____

Prescribe Remediation:

Comp. Ed. Teachers _____
Reg. Basic Skills Tchrs _____
Other _____

How often do you communicate with basic skills teachers on pupil progress?

Once Per Week _____
Weekly _____
Every Two Weeks _____
Once A Month _____
Once A Grading Period _____
Once A Semester _____
Other _____

Is this adequate?

_____
_____
_____

What methods are used to communicate with the basic skills teacher?

Common Planning Time _____
Scheduled Conferences _____
Skill Charts _____
Prescription Folders _____
Written Communication _____
Transmittal Forms _____
Classroom Vistations _____
Informal Meetings _____
Other _____

If there is an aide, what are their duties?

Reinforce Skills ____
Practice Activities ____
Tutoring: Individual ____ Group _____
Preparing Activities ____
Record Data ____
Other _____

COMPENSATORY EDUCATION
OBSERVATION FORM

Instruction - Continued

Evidence of State Minimum Standards

or Yes _____ No _____

Evidence of County Performance Objectives

Evidence Diagnostic/Prescriptive Instruction Yes _____ No _____

TPAI CP ___ Yes ___ No IP ___ Yes ___ No My Class ___ Yes ___ No

Actual Time _____ Minutes

Comments: _____

_____

_____

MY CLASS

NAME _____

GRADE _____

SCHOOL _____

TEACHER _____

DIRECTIONS

READ ALOUD TO PUPILS:

This is not a test. The questions inside are to find out what your class is like. Please answer all the questions.

Each sentence is meant to describe your class. If you agree with the sentence, circle yes. If you don't agree with the sentence, circle no.

If you don't understand any of the words in the questions, raise your hand and your teacher will read the word for you.

EXAMPLE

	Circle Your Answer	
1. Most children in the class are good friends.	Yes	No

If you think that most children in the class are good friends, circle the yes like this:

1. Most children in the class are good friends.	(Yes)	No

If you do not think that most children in the class are good friends, circle the no like this:

1. Most children in the class are good friends.	Yes	(No)

Now turn the page and answer all the questions about your class.

		Circle Your Answer	
1.	The pupils like their schoolwork in my class.	Yes	No
2.	Children are always fighting with each other.	Yes	No
3.	The same people always do the best work in our class.	Yes	No
4.	In our class the work is hard to do.	Yes	No
5.	My best friends are in my class.	Yes	No
6.	Some of the children in our class are mean.	Yes	No
7.	Most pupils like this class.	Yes	No
8.	Children often race to see who can finish first.	Yes	No
9.	Many children in the class play together after school.	Yes	No
10.	Most children can do their schoolwork without help.	Yes	No
11.	Some pupils don't like the class.	Yes	No
12.	Most children want their work to be better than their friend's work.	Yes	No
13.	Many children in our class like to fight.	Yes	No
14.	Only the smart people can do the work in our class.	Yes	No
15.	In my class everybody is my friend.	Yes	No

		Circle Your Answer	
16.	Most of the children in my class like school.	Yes	No
17.	Some pupils don't like other pupils.	Yes	No
18.	Some pupils feel bad when they do not do as well as the others.	Yes	No
19.	In my class I like to work with others.	Yes	No
20.	In our class all pupils know how to do their schoolwork.	Yes	No
21.	Most children say the class is fun.	Yes	No
22.	Some people in my class are not my friends.	Yes	No
23.	Children have secrets with other children in the class.	Yes	No
24.	Children often find their work hard.	Yes	No
25.	Most children don't care who finishes first.	Yes	No
26.	Some children don't like other children.	Yes	No
27.	Some pupils are not happy in class.	Yes	No
28.	All of the children know each other well.	Yes	No
29.	Only the smart pupils can do their work.	Yes	No
30.	Some pupils always try to do their work better than the others.	Yes	No

		Circle Your Answer	
31.	Children seem to like the class.	Yes	No
32.	Some pupils always want to have their own way.	Yes	No
33.	All pupils in my class are close friends.	Yes	No
34.	Many pupils in our class say that school is easy.	Yes	No
35.	In our class some pupils always want to do best.	Yes	No
36.	Some of the pupils don't like the class.	Yes	No
37.	Children in our class fight a lot.	Yes	No
38.	All of the pupils in my class like each other.	Yes	No
39.	Some pupils always do better than the rest of the class.	Yes	No
40.	Schoolwork is hard to do.	Yes	No
41.	Some pupils don't like what other pupils do.	Yes	No
42.	A few children in my class want to be first all of the time.	Yes	No
43.	The class is fun.	Yes	No
44.	Most of the pupils in my class know how to do their work.	Yes	No
45.	Children in our class like each other as friends.	Yes	No

This instrument was developed at Harvard University by Gary J. Anderson and Herbert J. Walbert, May 1968. Revised, January 1969, by G.J. Anderson and Ronald E. Cayne, Faculty of Education, McGill University.

PERCENT OF "YES" RESPONSES BY STUDENTS SURVEYED
DURING THE SCHOOL YEARS 1981-82 and 1983-84
WITH THE ATTITUDE INSTRUMENT "MY CLASS"

		1981-82 % "Yes" n=582	1983-84 % "Yes" n=589
1.	The pupils like their schoolwork in my class.	82	83
2.	Children are always fighting with each other.	46	37
3.	The same people always do the best work in our class.	70	61
4.	In our class, the work is hard to do.	29	32
5.	My best friends are in my class.	75	73
6.	Some of the children in our class are mean.	49	59
7.	Most puils like this class.	78	80
8.	Children often race to see who can finish first.	54	63
9.	Many children in the class play together after school	90	87
10.	Most children can do their schoolwork without help.	84	81
11.	Some puils don't like the class.	41	51
12.	Most children want their work to be better than their friend's work.	77	82
13.	Many children in our class like to fight.	48	47
14.	Only the smart people can do the work in our class.	33	45
15.	In my class everybody is my friend.	62	62
16.	Most of the children in my class like school.	85	80
17.	Some pupils don't like other pupils.	47	52
18.	Some pupils feel bad when they do not do as well as the others.	86	80
19.	In my class I like to work with others.	94	92
20.	In our class all pupils know how to do their schoolwork.	74	64
21.	Most children say the class is fun.	82	80

This instrument was developed at Harvard University by Gary J. Anderson and Herbert J. Walbert, May 1968. Revised, January 1969, by G. J. Anderson and Ronald E. Cayne, Faculty of Education, McGill University.

		1981-82 % "Yes" n=582	1983-84 % "Yes" n=589
22.	Some people in my class are not my friends.	51	55
23.	Children have secrets with other children in the class.	60	61
24.	Children often find their work hard.	55	62
25.	Most children don't care who finishes first.	58	60
26.	Some children don't like other children.	55	65
27.	Some pupils are not happy in class.	46	50
28.	All of the children know each other well.	86	80
29.	Only the smart pupils can do their work.	19	42
30.	Some pupils always try to do their work better than the others.	82	80
31.	Children seem to like the class.	95	87
32.	Some pupils always want to have their own way.	58	72
33.	All pupils in my class are close friends.	68	65
34.	Many pupils in our class say that school is easy.	52	43
35.	In our class some pupils always want to do best.	93	92
36.	Some of the pupils don't like the class.	36	51
37.	Children in our class fight a lot.	40	43
38.	All of the pupils in my class like each other.	59	52
39.	Some pupils always do better than the rest of the class.	73	76
40.	Schoolwork is hard to do.	30	44
41.	Some pupils don't like what other pupils do.	62	65
42.	A few children in my class want to be first all of the time.	74	74
43.	The class is fun.	87	82
44.	Most of the pupils in my class know how to do their work.	93	87
45.	Children in our class like each other as friends.	81	80

PRINTOUT FOR JEAN BAKER

STANFORD ANALYSIS FOR SELECTION

FILE PAGE2

* CROSSTABULATION OF *
GR BY READ
* PAGE 1 OF 1

GR	READ COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	1-10% (1.)	11-15% (2.)	16-21% (3.)	22-49% (4.)	50-69% (5.)	70-100% (6.)	ROW TOTAL
0.		312	247	229	1111	836	0	2735
		11.4	9.0	8.4	40.6	30.6	0.0	8.7
		15.9	17.6	13.3	11.2	11.9	0.0	
		1.0	0.8	0.7	3.5	2.6	0.0	
1.		382	207	249	1373	996	1993	5200
		7.3	4.0	4.8	26.4	19.2	38.3	16.5
		19.5	14.7	14.4	13.8	14.2	21.1	
		1.2	0.7	0.8	4.4	3.2	6.3	
2.		306	212	256	1410	1245	2125	5554
		5.5	3.8	4.6	25.4	22.4	38.3	17.6
		15.6	15.1	14.8	14.2	17.7	22.5	
		1.0	0.7	0.8	4.5	3.9	6.7	
3.		320	269	251	1738	1304	2064	5946
		5.4	4.5	4.2	29.2	21.9	34.7	18.8
		16.3	19.1	14.5	17.4	18.6	21.8	
		1.0	0.9	0.8	5.5	4.1	6.5	
4.		296	296	378	2040	1350	1558	5918
		5.0	5.0	6.4	34.5	22.8	26.3	18.8
		15.1	21.1	21.9	20.5	19.2	16.5	
		0.9	0.9	1.2	6.5	4.3	4.9	
5.		347	175	365	2290	1297	1725	6199
		5.6	2.8	5.9	36.9	20.9	27.8	19.6
		17.7	12.4	21.1	23.0	18.5	18.2	
		1.1	0.6	1.2	7.3	4.1	5.5	
COLUMN TOTAL		1963 6.2	1406 4.5	1728 5.5	9962 31.6	7028 22.3	9465 30.0	31552 100.0

CHI SQUARE = 1943.18555 WITH 25 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0
CRAMER'S V = 0.11098
CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT = 0.24086
LAMBDA (ASYMMETRIC) = 0.02453 WITH GR DEPENDENT. = 0.07693 WITH READ DEPENDENT.
LAMBDA (SYMMETRIC) = 0.04863
UNCERTAINTY COEFFICIENT (ASYMMETRIC) = 0.02412 WITH GR DEPENDENT. = 0.02779 WITH READ DEPENDENT.
UNCERTAINTY COEFFICIENT (SYMMETRIC) = 0.02583

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PRINTOUT FOR JEAN BAKER

FILE PAGE2

STANFORD ANALYSIS FOR SELECTION

* CROSSTABULATION OF * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

GR BY MATH

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * \

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION RULE

6A-1.9911 Basic skills and functional literacy compensatory education program.

(1) Application and approval of district programs. To qualify for funds under the Compensatory Education Act of 1977, each district school board shall submit a plan to the commissioner for approval. This plan shall include, but not be limited to, the following:

(a) A description of all remedial and compensatory programs operated in the preceding school fiscal year and programs operating currently in each school in the district, excluding any program to be supported with state compensatory education funds as described in (b) below. The description shall include:

1. Identification of programs conducted at each separate school or location in the district;

2. The number of students who participated, numbers of teachers, volunteers and others utilized, and expenditures by fund source for each of these programs operated in the preceding year; and

3. The number of students participating, number of teachers, volunteers and others utilized, and budgets by fund source for each of these programs operating currently.

(b) A description of programs to be operated with funds received under this act. The description shall include:

1. Identification of programs to be conducted at each separate school or location in the district;

2. Estimates of the number of students who will participate, number of teachers, volunteers and others to be utilized, and budgets for each of these programs;

3. Evidence that each student selected for participation has been identified by the district as needing special educational assistance in basic skills and that selection was made on an equitable objective basis;

4. Evidence that programs are based on performance objectives related to achievement in basic skills consistent with minimum student performance standards adopted by the State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.941, FAC;

5. Evidence that programs will provide additional direct instructional services to meet the specific educational needs in basic skills of each student participating in the program;*

6. Evidence that individual students participating in these programs will be pre-tested and post-tested for evaluation purposes in a manner consistent with the performance objectives;

7. Procedures to be used in collecting and reporting program data to enable the district to submit a report annually, on a date specified by the commissioner, detailing the number of students participating in programs; the full-time equivalent student membership; the extent to which student achievement increased; programs in reading, writing and mathematics where the greatest gain in achievement occurred; and an analysis of the expenditure of funds.

(c) Assurances that state compensatory education funds received will:

1. Provide for direct remedial instruction in basic skills to selected students in K-12 programs;

2. Support programs which in the professional opinion of the instructional staff will be most effective;

3. Result in no decrease of state, local or federal funds used for educationally deprived children;

4. Be supplemental to FEFP [illegible] by students while participating in the program and to any other state or local remedial and compensatory programs, and be allocated and expended in a manner which will not violate the comparability requirements of Title I of the elementary and secondary education act (P.L. 89-10).

(2) Evaluation of effectiveness of district programs. In analyzing and evaluating the effectiveness of district compensatory education programs, the department shall base its studies on growth in the basic skills of reading, writing and mathematics, as determined by gains between pre-tests and post-tests administered to students in each approved program.

(a) Pre-test and post-test scores shall be collected for all students participating in the program. When statewide assessment basic skills tests (grades 3, 5, 8, 11) or the functional literacy test (grade 11) are used, the same test administration may serve as both the identification and selection test and as the pre-test for students in these grades. The functional literacy test may also be used as the post-test when used as the pre-test. All other tests must meet the criteria in (b) below and may serve as both the identification and selection test and the pre-test if they are administered within 30 school days of the beginning of the program or at the time the student enters the program. If the identification and selection test is a separate test from the pre-test, the pre-test shall be administered within 30 calendar days of the beginning of the program. All post-tests, except the state functional literacy test, shall be administered within 30 calendar days of the termination of the program or at the time the student terminates membership in the program, whichever is first.

(b) Pre-tests and post-tests used by the district shall be capable of producing a valid measure of basic skills and, beginning in 1978-79, shall be capable of producing comparative scores between districts.

(3) Expenditure of compensatory education funds. Contingent upon approval of a district's compensatory education program plan, state compensatory education funds may be expended for obligations incurred by the district for direct instructional services beginning with the date of receipt by the department of a substantially approvable plan.

(4) Fiscal accounting and reporting requirements. State compensatory education funds and local funds expended in these programs shall be accounted for in the General Fund by the dimensions of project, school function and object as defined in "A Manual...Financial and Program Cost Accounting and Reporting for Florida Schools," Rule 6A-1.01, FAC. All federal compensatory education funds shall be accounted for in the Special Revenue Fund by the dimensions of project, school, function and object as defined in 'A Manual...Financial and Program Cost Accounting and Reporting for Florida Schools." Each district shall report on the fiscal and instructional aspects and results of all evaluations of its program on the dates and in the manner prescribed by the commissioner.

Specific Authority 229.053(1), 236.088(5)(b) FS. Law Implemented 236.088 FS. History—New 5-1-78.

*and that these services offer equitable, districtwide, instructional opportunities to students having similar academic needs; (amended April 8, 1981).

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

FLORIDA COMPENSATORY EDUCATION ACT OF 1977

236.086 Basic skills and functional literacy compensatory supplement.—

(1) SHORT TITLE.—This section shall be known and may be cited as the "Florida Compensatory Education Act of 1977."

(2) PURPOSE AND INTENT.—The purpose of this section is to provide supplemental funds to each school district to be used for the sole purpose of providing direct remedial instruction to those students enrolled in the K-12 program who have need of special educational assistance in order that their level of educational attainment may be raised to that appropriate for their age. It is the intent of the Legislature that each school district shall utilize the instructional programs which in the professional opinion of the teacher will be most effective and that the effectiveness of this program shall be evaluated in terms of the increase in student achievement in the basic skills of reading, mathematics, and writing as measured by pretest and post-test of each student receiving special educational assistance from the funds provided by this section.

(3) ALLOCATION OF FUNDS.—The funds appropriated annually for this section shall be allocated proportionately to each school district on the basis of the number of students in grades 3, 5, 8, and 11 whose scores on the statewide student assessment tests are at the 25th percentile or below.

(4) DISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS.—

(a) To be eligible to receive funds under this section, a school district shall describe in writing its compensatory education program. The description shall include all special remedial and compensatory instruction to be provided by the district from all fund sources. The district description shall include a description of the program to be conducted at each separate school or location in the district and shall include the estimated number of students to participate in the program; the estimated number of teachers, volunteers, and others to be utilized in the program; and the estimated budget for each such program.

(b) The programs provided by funds received under this section shall meet the following criteria:

1. Each participating student shall be determined by the school district on the basis of the district's assessment tests to need special educational assistance in order that the student's level of educational attainment in basic skills may be raised to that appropriate for children of the student's age.

2. The program is based on performance objectives related to educational achievement in the basic skills and provides supplementary services designed to meet the special educational needs of each participating student.

3. The program is evaluated in a manner consistent with the performance objectives and includes a pretest and post-test for each participating student.

4. The state and local funds expended in the program shall be accounted for separately from all other funds expended by the district. Expenditures shall be reported as a categorical program in the manner prescribed by the State Board of Education.

5. The program shall be conducted in a manner which shall permit the exclusion of instructional staff members employed through the use of funds in this program from the comparability requirements of Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

6. The program shall be approved by the Commissioner of Education within 60 days of receipt of the program description, and the department shall forward funds to the district.

7. Each application by a district for a grant under the state compensatory education program shall contain an assurance that the use of the grant funds will not result in a decrease in the use for educationally deprived children of state, local, or federal funds which, in the absence of funds under the compensatory education program, have been made available for the education of such children. No projects under the state compensatory education program shall be approved unless the state funds for the compensatory education program will not be used to supplant other state, local, or federal funds being used for the education of such students.

(5) ADMINISTRATION.—

(a) The Division of Public Schools shall be utilized as needed to provide technical assistance to districts and to carry out the department's responsibilities for reviewing, monitoring, and evaluating the programs conducted under this section.

(b) The State Board of Education shall adopt rules which in its opinion are necessary to assure that the programs in each school district are carried out in a manner consistent with the purpose and intent of this section. The Commissioner of Education shall prepare, on or before January 10 of each year, a report which shall show the number of students participating in programs under this section, the extent to which student achievement increased, the programs which appear to be most successful, and an analysis of the expenditure of funds by district. Said report shall be transmitted to the State Board of Education and the presiding officers of the Legislature.

(c) Beginning with the 1978-1979 school year, the Commissioner shall evaluate the cost effectiveness of the district compensatory education programs. Of the district programs which have been in operation for 2 or more years, state funding shall be terminated for the five programs which are determined to be the least cost effective each year.

History.—s. 1, ch. 77-262.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE